



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09 817,912	03 26 2001	Long Hai Wu	3330	8107

7590 12 19 2002

Keith A. Vogt
NIRO, SCAVONE, HALLER & NIRO
181 W. Madison Street - Suite 4600
Chicago, IL 60602

EXAMINER

HODGES, MATTHEW P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 12 19 2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,912

Applicant(s)

WU, LONG HAI

Examiner

Matt P Hodges

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 14-24 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1 ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- 2 ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
- 3 ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-13, drawn to a polarized electroluminescence device, classified in class 313, subclass 112.
- II. Claims 14-24, drawn to a method of manufacture for a polarized electroluminescence device, classified in class 427, subclass 66.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the polarized electroluminescence device could be manufactured by a number of methods. Layers could be spin coated, dipped, or sputtered.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Keith Vogt on 12/11/2002 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-13. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 14-24 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takiguchi et al. (US 6,491,847).

Regarding claims 1-3, 6-8, and 13, Takiguchi discloses (see figure 1) an organic EL device including a glass substrate (11), an aligning anode (12), a liquid Crystal layer (13) and an organic light-emitting element (14). (Column 10 lines 52-67). The liquid crystal layer is a hole-transporting layer made from a discotic liquid crystal compound. (Column 9 lines 3-5). Further

Art Unit: 2879

the liquid crystal layer and organic layer is aligned according the pattern of the anode. (Column 11 lines 64-67).

Regarding claim 5, it is further noted that the direction of polarization of the emitted light will be in the direction that the organic layer is aligned. (See Hikmet et al. 5,748,271). Thus the emitted light will be aligned with the aligning element.

Regarding claim 12, Takiguchi discloses the use of this combination to create an Electroluminescence Device. This device is equivalent to an electroluminescence display.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takiguchi et al. (US 6,491,847) in view of Hikmet et al. (5,748,271).

Regarding claim 4, Takiguchi discloses the claimed invention as described in the rejection of claims 1 and 3 above but does not specifically state the use of polyimide to align the subsequent layers. However Hikmet discloses the use of polyimide as a well-known material used to induce orientation. (Column 2 lines 50-57). Further the use of polyimide allows for the practice of rubbing the surface to prepare the layer. Rubbing allows for ease of manufacture and allows for other substrates to be used as compared to Ultra Violet alignment. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the

Art Unit: 2879

art to incorporate the polyimide layer as disclosed by Hikmet in the EL device as disclosed by Takiguchi in order to ease the manufacture of the device.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takiguchi et al. (US 6,491,847).

Regarding claim 11, Takiguchi discloses the use of an EL device to provide a polarized beam of light, but Takiguchi does not specify the use of this device as a backlight for an LCD. However the use of a polarized backlight formed from an EL device is well known in the art of LCD manufacture thus it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to use the EL device as disclosed by Takiguchi as a backlight for an LCD.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 9 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 9, the references of the Prior Art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of the limitations as set forth in claim 9, and specifically comprising the limitation of the use of a polyimide or polyphenylamide as the EL material in the light emitting layer of the device.

Regarding claim 10, the references of the Prior Art of record fails to teach or suggest the combination of the limitations as set forth in claim 10, and specifically comprising the limitation

Art Unit: 2879

of the use of a light emitting layer in the polarized EL element where the light emitting element had a cross-linking polymer.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hanrahan et al. (US 6,262,788) discloses the use of alignment films for discotic liquid crystal layers.


Kumar et al. (US 5,936,691) discloses the use of alignment layers formed by UV projection.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matt P Hodges whose telephone number is (703) 305-4015. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7382 for regular communications and (703) 308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

mph 
December 16, 2002


NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800